REMARKS

Claims 25 and 26 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 25 and 26 are amended to more clearly define the invention. New claims 27-29 are added. No new matter has been added by this amendment and support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification.

Claim Rejection 35 USC § 102

Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ellis (U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the reasons set forth below. However, in the interest of furthering the prosecution of this case, Applicants have amended claims 25 and 26 to recite limitations that are neither taught nor suggested by Ellis.

For a claim to be anticipated every limitation of the claim must be expressly or inherently disclosed in a single prior art reference. The cited prior art Ellis is related to secure communication sessions in a distributed communications environment. Bandwidth for a secure communication session is increased by assigning a plurality of agents to a client and distributing packets from a client application among the agents for processing. "The invention architecture of Ellis is comprised of a main server, agents and clients... This technology allows software-based VPN solutions to perform at wire-speed levels." (Ellis, Col. 6, lines 50-55). In effect, as illustrated in figures 5A and 5B of Ellis, the standard protocol headers of the packets comprising the communication between the client and the main server are modified to route the packets through one or more agents. IP headers in the packet are modified by the client 5A10 and the gateway 5A40 to route data packets through different agents to the final destination. However, to achieve

this distribution of packets,

> "[a]n overall system algorithm proceeds as follows: *1. The client authenticates to the main server 2. The server gets the client information including the bandwidth requirements to determine how many agents to assign to the client 3. The server sends the client a NAT* (Network Address Translation) table, which is used to forward IP packets from host to another host. The NAT table contains the actual IP addresses of assigned agents *4. The server sends the agents a NAT table update to add the client to their existing client list 4a.* The server initiates a dataflow test to ensure that the microflows from each agent will be reassembled properly by the TCP/IP module on the destination..." (Ellis, Col. 8, lines 28-45)

Thus, Ellis always requires the Main server to participate in initiation of a secure connection with the client as seen, for example, in steps 1 through 4 of the aforementioned overall system algorithm. Main server participation is necessitated to activate the agent or agents that may subsequently participate in the communication transfer.

In contrast, the invention of Applicant's claims responds to the client's cryptographic suite without initiating a separate process on the server between the time the client's cryptographic suite is receive and the client sends the server the pre-master secret key. Applicant's invention responds to a client request either without the use of a server or by using a single process on the server to respond to cryptographic suites received from all clients.

Futhermore, as seen in figure 7 of Ellis, the application data is broken into M discrete packets and sent through encryption XOR chain. These packets are separately encrypted by the low level process 710. Figure 8 of Ellis shows such packets for an example. The packets traverse routers and spread as they follow the shortest path to the agents 720. More diffusion occurs as packets continue on their journey 730 packets from each application part reach their assigned agent and are decrypted individually 740 shows the packets destined for the same device begin to draw closer and packet concentration occurs 760 as packets get closer to the destination. Decrypted packets reach the destination and are reassembled 770.

In contrast, Applicant's invention requires all of the communication be received at the server side without any modification of the packets during transit between the client and the server.

Lastly, Ellis merely discloses an agent which is recited as performing the tasks of the agent (see Col. 5, lines 15-25, for example) without teaching or suggesting the specific process steps of the Applicant's claims.

Clearly, Ellis neither teaches nor suggests the invention of Applicant's claims 25 and 26 as currently amended and therefore cannot anticipate Applicant's claims 25 and 26 and any claims dependent therefrom.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Brad Pedersen
Registration No. 32,432

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thuente, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 349-5774